UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/241,335	02/01/1999	XINZHONG LEON XU	99-P-7449-US	8596

7590 03/11/2005

SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
186 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER	
ESCALANTE, OVIDIO	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2645	

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/241,335	XU, XINZHONG LEON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ovidio Escalante	2645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 January 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14-21 and 23-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12,14-21 and 23-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment filed on November 24, 2004. **Claims 1-12,14-21 and 23-26** are now pending in the present application.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/24/2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-6,8,9,14-19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bjornberg et al. US Patent 6,647,111.

Regarding claim 1, Bjornberg teaches an interactive voice response system, (col. 2, lines 42-55), comprising:

a plurality of general-purpose blocks (primitive SIBBs; col. 9, lines 37-50), each general purpose block being coupled to at least one other general purpose block (fig. 5; col. 9, lines 37-

50; each common SIBB can connect to each other), wherein each general-purpose block plays a prompt (col. 12, lines 5-10; e.g., if the general blocks are menu blocks, the block will prompt the caller for a menu response) and is configurable to send a first signal (timeout error; fig. 7n) without requiring input after playing the prompt (if a there is no input a timeout error will occur; col. 11, lines 42-47) or send a second signal according to received input after playing the prompt (col. 12, lines 30-59; col. 11, lines 41-48; menu selection prompt will pass the users input); and

a plurality of transfer blocks (col. 10, lines 49-67), each transfer block being coupled to a general-purpose block (fig. 5; every menu block can have e.g. a call transfer block so that the caller can be routed to the proper destination) to receive one of the first or second signals and is configurable to transfer a call to a specified telephone number, (fig. 7d; col. 10, lines 49-67).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Bjornberg teaches wherein each general-purpose block plays a prompt by accessing at least a sound file and wherein the sound file accessed by each general-purpose block can be configured, (fig. 6; col. 9, lines 26-35).

Regarding claims 4-6 and 17-19, Bjornberg teaches wherein if a general-purpose block is configured to send the second signal according to received input, the general-purpose block receives the input and wherein the general purpose-block receives the input by receiving a key or string of keys which represent DTMF information, (col. 4, lines 26-36; col. 11, lines 41-49; col. 12, lines 6-10).

Regarding claim 8, Bjornberg teaches wherein the general-purpose block processes the received input by selecting the second signal according to the received input, (col. 12, lines 6-10).

Regarding claims 9-12 and 21, Bjornberg teaches wherein the general-purpose block determines if there was an error in the received input, (fig. 7n; col. 12, lines 7-10).

Regarding claim 14, Bjornberg teaches wherein the second signal from a first general-purpose block is received by a second general-purpose block, (col. 12, lines 6-10; menu selection e.g. #1 in fig. 7n can allow the caller to go to a second menu block).

Regarding claims 15 and 23, Bjornberg teaches a method of generating an interactive voice response application (abstract; col. 2, lines 42-55), comprising:

providing a plurality of general-purpose blocks (primitive SIBBs; col. 9, lines 37-50), each general-purpose block being preconfigured to send signals to at least one other general-purpose block, (col. 10, lines 59-67; col. 11, lines 42-47; col. 12, lines 30-59);

selecting a general purpose block, (fig. 6; col. 10, lines 4-24);

specifying a prompt that the selected general-purpose block will play, (fig. 6; col. 10, lines 18-24);

specifying whether the selected general-purpose block will send a first signal without requiring input after playing the prompt or send a second signal according to received input after playing the prompt, (fig. 7d; col. 12, lines 30-59; col. 11, lines 41-48);

providing a plurality of transfer blocks (col. 10, lines 49-67) to receive one of the first or second signals to transfer a call to a telephone number, (fig. 7d);

selecting a transfer block, (fig. 7d); and

specifying the telephone number for the selected transfer block, (col. 10, lines 49-67).

Regarding claim 16, Bjornberg teaches wherein specifying a prompt that the selected general-purpose block will play includes specifying a file that stores the prompt, said prompt being a sound message, (fig. 6; col. 9, lines 26-35; col. 10, lines 18-24).

5. Claims 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hammarström et al. US Patent 6,044,142.

Regarding claim 24, Hammarström teaches a method of modifying an interactive voice response system at run-time, (col. 2, lines 46-65; col. 3, lines 18-32; an operator will modify the callers automated service by selecting and sequencing service script modules (i.e. SIBs; col. 2, lines 2-5)), comprising:

executing the interactive voice response system, the system including a plurality of general-purpose blocks (service independent building blocks; col. 2, lines 2-16) and a plurality of transfer blocks that are configurable to transfer a call to a specified telephone number, (col. 3, lines 47-67; col. 4, lines 18-24; col. 8, line 5);

modifying a configuration of a selected general-purpose block; and updating the configuration of the selected general-purpose block at run-time, (col. 3, lines 58-64).

Regarding claim 25, Hammarström teaches wherein modifying a configuration of a selected general-purpose block includes storing a configuration parameter in a database, (col. 3, lines 58-67).

Regarding claim 26, Hammarström teaches wherein an object monitors the database and sends a signal to the selected general-purpose block that the configuration has changed, (col. 8, lines 9-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 7,10-12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjornberg et al. US Patent 6,647,111 in view of Malik US Patent 6,463,130.

Regarding claims 7 and 20, Bjornberg, as applied above, does not teach of playing a no-input prompt. However, Bjornberg suggest of indicating that no-input was received, therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to play a no-input prompt so that the user can be reminded to input a response.

Nonetheless, Malik teaches wherein the general-purpose block plays a no-input prompt if the general-purpose block does not receive the input within a predetermined amount of time, (col. 3, lines 33-36). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to play a no input prompt so that the caller can be alerted that an input is required if they did not hear the first prompt.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Bjornberg by playing a no-input prompt as taught by Malik so that the calling party can be notified that an input is needed in order to progress through the call.

Regarding claims 10-12 and 21, while Bjornberg, as applied above, teaches of determining if there is an error in the input, Bjornberg does not teach of sending an error prompt if there was an error.

Malik teaches wherein the general-purpose block determines if their was an error in the received input, and wherein the general-purpose block continues receiving the input after the

error prompt is played. Malik also teaches wherein the general-purpose block plays the prompt after the error prompt is played, (col. 3, lines 29-41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Bjornberg by determining errors in the input and playing an error prompt as taught by Malik so that the system can notify the caller that their input was not correct and can re-request that the caller re-enter their information.

8. Claims 1 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson US Patent 6,314,164 in view of Bjornberg.

Regarding claim 1, Johnson teaches an interactive voice response system, (abstract), comprising:

a plurality of general-purpose blocks (service node; col. 2, lines 22-37), each general-purpose block being coupled to at least one other general-purpose block, (fig. 1), wherein each general purpose-block plays a prompt (col. 4, lines 40-56; col. 5, lines 11-30) and is configurable to at least two configurations, one configuration sends a first signal without requiring input after playing the prompt (col. 13, lines 10-37) and another configuration sends a second signal according to received input after playing the prompt, (col. 4, lines 40-56).

Johnson does not specifically teach a plurality of transfer blocks being coupled to the nodes.

In the same field of endeavor, Bjornberg teaches a plurality of transfer blocks (col. 10, lines 49-67), each transfer block being coupled to a general-purpose block (fig. 5; every menu block can have e.g. a call transfer block so that the caller can be routed to the proper destination)

to receive one of the first or second signals and is configurable to transfer a call to a specified telephone number, (fig. 7d; col. 10, lines 49-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the nodes of Johnson by adding transfer block which transfer the caller to a number as taught by Bjornberg so that the caller can be routed to the proper end destination.

Regarding claim 15, Johnson teaches a method of generating an interactive voice response application, (abstract), comprising:

providing a plurality of general-purpose blocks, each general-purpose block being pre-configured to send signals to at least one other general-purpose block, (col. 2, lines 22-37; fig. 1);

selecting a general-purpose block, (col. 4, lines 40-56; col. 5, lines 11-30);

specifying a prompt that the select general-purpose block will play, (col. 4, lines 40-56);

specifying one of two configurations, where in one configuration the selected general-purpose block will send a first signal without requiring input after playing the prompt (col. 13, lines 10-34) and in another configuration the selected general-purpose block will send a second signal according to received input after playing the prompt, (col. 4, lines 40-56)

Johnson does not specifically teach a plurality of transfer blocks being coupled to the nodes.

In the same field of endeavor, Bjornberg teaches providing a plurality of transfer blocks (col. 10, lines 49-67) to receive one of the first or second signals to transfer a call to a telephone number, (fig. 7d); selecting a transfer block, (fig. 7d); and specifying the telephone number for the selected transfer block, (col. 10, lines 49-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the nodes of Johnson by adding transfer block which transfer the caller to a number as taught by Bjornberg so that the caller can be routed to the proper end destination.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed May 14, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1 and 15, Applicant contends that neither the timeout-error nor the input_error of Bjornberg are a first signal that is sent without requiring input after playing a prompt. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As disclosed above, in the office action, Bjornberg teaches of sending two different types of signals (signal is read as the output line as shown in fig. 7n since the output line is signaling the output of the block). The second signal is sent as a menu selection in response to a menu option prompt. This can be for example DTMF or speech input. The first signal is e.g., a timeout-error signal which does not in itself require input since timeout is sent when there is no input. The Examiner believes that since the figures shows a timeout signal being sent and since the specification teaches that a timeout signal is sent when there is no input then Bjornberg meets the first signal limitation.

The Applicant further states that at best the OA has presented a reference that describes a block that can implement a menu and send a signal if an input timeout occurs. Applicant then states that this does not read on the general-purpose block that is recited in claim one and it has

not been shown to be configurable in the two configurations that are recited in the claims. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The claim broadly recites a general-purpose block which is configurable to send a first signal without requiring input and a second input according to input after playing the prompt. Since the Examiner has shown that multiple signals can be sent from the block when the block is a general-purpose menu block, then the Examiner believes that each limitation reads on the prior art. For example as stated above, the first signal can broadly read on a timeout signal and shown by Bjornberg and further emphasized with newly cited reference Johnson in which a timeout signal is sent after a prompt is played and no signal is received. If there is an input such as with entering data with DTMF tones or speech then another type of signal is sent which will indicate what was entered. This second signal configures the block to send the information to another block for processing.

Regarding claims 24-26, Applicants contend that Hammarström does not disclose that the operator modifies SIBs nor that the configuration is updated at run-time as claimed. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner believes that Hammarström anticipates claim 24 in view of Applicant's arguments. Applicants contend that Hammarström does not teach, "modifying a configuration of a selected general-purpose block"; and" updating the configuration of the selected general-purpose block at run-time".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees since Hammarström teaches that SIBs are used to process a call and when a customer wants additional service then an operator can modify the SIBs so that the customer requested service can be setup. Since an operator is able to modify a

customer's service by using SIBs and since the network is able to initiate the service in real time then the Examiner believes that Hammarström teaches of modifying a configuration of a selected general-purpose block; and updating the configuration of the selected general-purpose block at run time.

Conclusion

10. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 872-9306, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

220 20th Street S.
Crystal Plaza two, Lobby, Room 1B03
Arlington, VA 22202

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ovidio Escalante whose telephone number is 703-308-6262 (571-272-7537 After March 22, 2005). The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th from 6:30 to 4:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan S Tsang can be reached on 703-305-4895 (571-272-7547 After March 22, 2005).

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OVIDIO ESCALANTE
PATENT EXAMINER

Ovidio Escalante

Ovidio Escalante
Examiner
Group 2645
March 7, 2005

O.E./oe